with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 18 CFR 385.214). All such motions or protests should be filed on or before the comment date. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–23658 Filed 9–22–95; 8:45 am]

[Docket No. CP95-614-000]

Paiute Pipeline Company; Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Paiute LNG Project and Request for Comments on Environmental Issues

September 19, 1995.

The staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) will prepare an environmental assessment (EA) that will discuss the environmental impacts of the construction and operation of facilities proposed in the Paiute LNG Project. This EA will be used by the Commission in its decision-making process to determine whether an environmental impact statement is necessary and whether to approve the project.¹

Summary of the Proposed Project

Paiute Pipeline Company (Paiute) is seeking approval to construct and operate a 300-gallon-per-minute truck unloading facility at its liquefied natural gas (LNG) storage facility near Lovelock, Pershing County, Nevada. The purpose of the project is to give Paiute the ability to provide its LNG storage service customers with additional options for helping to meet their peak demand, emergency, or other requirements.

The LNG truck unloading facility would include transfer piping, valves, and appurtenant facilities. The proposed truck unloading station would be able to unload six 10,000-gallon tankers per day for the equivalent of 5,000 MCF per day.

The proposed project facilities would be designed, constructed, and maintained to comply with the U.S.

Department of Transportation Federal Safety Standards for Liquefied Natural Gas Facilities (49 CFR Part 193). The facilities would also meet the National Fire Protection Association 59A LNG standards.

LNG would be transported to the site by LNG tanker trucks. The preferred routing from eastern locations would be to exit Interstate 80 (I-80) at exit 107 onto Cornell Avenue to 14th Street. The route would turn north on Central Avenue, continuing to Pitt Road. A westerly turn onto Pitt Road would lead the trucks directly to the LNG Plant. For traffic from the west, the preferred route would be to exit I-80 at exit 105, then continue through the commercial portion of Lovelock via Cornell Avenue to 14th Street, and then as above. This route would avoid any grade level crossing of the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks.

As an alternative, all trucks could be routed off I–80 at exit 112, follow an alternative route that runs southwest on Upper Valley Road, and then west on Pitt Road. However, this route does require a grade level crossing of the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks at exit 112

The location of the project facilities is shown in appendix $1.^2$

Land Requirements for Construction

The proposed facilities would be constructed within the 20-acre, previously-disturbed, fenced LNG plant site.

The EA Process

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires the Commission to take into account the environmental impacts that could result from an action whenever it considers the issuance of a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. NEPA also requires us to discover and address concerns the public may have about proposals. We call this "scoping". The main goal of the scoping process is to focus the analysis in the EA on the important environmental issues. By this Notice of Intent, the Commission requests public comments on the scope of the issues it will address in the EA. All comments received are considered during the preparation of the EA. State and local government representatives are encouraged to notify their constituents

of this proposed action and encourage them to comment on their areas of concern.

The EA will discuss impacts that could occur as a result of the construction and operation of the proposed project under these general headings:

- Vegetation and wildlife
- Cultural Resources
- Land Use
- Air Quality and Noise
- Public Safety

We will also evaluate possible alternatives to the proposed project or portions of the project, and make recommendations on how to lessen or avoid impacts on the various resource areas.

Our independent analysis of the issues will be in the EA. Depending on the comments received during the scoping process, the EA may be published and mailed to Federal, state, and local agencies, public interest groups, interested individuals, affected landowners, newspapers, libraries, and the Commission's official service list for this proceeding. A comment period will be allotted for review if the EA is published. We will consider all comments on the EA before we recommend that the Commission approve or not approve the project.

Public Participation and Scoping Meetings

You can make a difference by sending a letter addressing your specific comments or concerns about the project. You should focus on the potential environmental effects of the proposal, alternatives to the proposal (including alternative trucking routes), and measures to avoid or lessen environmental impact. The more specific your comments, the more useful they will be. Please follow the instructions below to ensure that your comments are received and properly recorded:

- Address your letter to: Lois Cashell, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol St., NE, Washington, DC 20426;
- Reference Docket No. CP95-614-000;
- Send a copy of your letter to: Mr.
 James Dashukewich, EA Project
 Manager, Federal Energy Regulatory
 Commission, 825 North Capitol St., NE,
 Room 7312, Washington, D.C. 20426;
 and
- Mail your comments so that they are received in Washington, D.C. on or before October 19, 1995.

Becoming an Intervenor

In addition to involvement in the EA scoping process, you may want to

¹ Paiute Pipeline Company's application was filed under Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act and Part 157 of the Commission's regulations.

²The appendices referenced in this notice are not being printed in the Federal Register. Copies are available from the Commission's Public Reference and Files Maintenance Branch, Room 3104, 941 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, or call (202) 208–1371. Copies of the appendices were sent to all those receiving this notice in the mail

become an official party to the proceeding or an "intervenor". Among other things, intervenors have the right to receive copies of case-related Commission documents and filings by other intervenors. Likewise, each intervenor must provide copies of its filings to all other parties. If you want to become an intervenor, you must file a motion to intervene according to Rule 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214) (see appendix 2).

Filing of timely motions to intervene in this proceeding should be made on or before September 25, 1995. Once this date has passed, parties seeking to file late interventions must show good cause, as required by Section 385.214(b)(3), why this time limitation should be waived. Environmental issues have been viewed as good cause for late intervention. You do not need intervenor status to have your scoping comments considered.

Environmental Mailing List

This notice is being sent to all potential interested parties to solicit focused comments regarding environmental considerations related to the proposed project.

If you do not want to send comments at this time but still want to keep informed and receive copies of the EA, please return the Information Request (see appendix 3). If you do not return the Information Request, you will be taken off the mailing list.

Additional information about the proposed project is available from Mr. James Dashukewich, EA Project Manager, at (202) 208–0117.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–23659 Filed 9–22–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Project No. 3195-064 California]

Sayles Hydro Associates; Notice of Availability of Environmental Assessment

September 19, 1995.

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission's) Regulations, 18 CFR part 380 (Order 486, 52 FR 47897), the Commission's Office of Hydropower Licensing has reviewed a non-capacity related amendment of license for the Sayles Flat Hydroelectric Project, No. 3195–064. The Sayles Flat Project is located on the South Fork American River in El Dorado County, California. The plan is for the

removal of project facilities and restoration of the site. An Environmental Assessment (EA) was prepared for the plan. The EA finds that approving the plan would not constitute a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

Copies of the EA are available for review in the Public Reference Branch, Room 3104, of the Commission's offices at 941 North Capitol Street NE., Washington, DC 20426.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–23661 Filed 9–22–95; 8:45 am]

Notice of Application Tendered for Filing With the Commission

September 11, 1995.

Take notice that the following hydroelectric application has been filed with the Commission and is available for public inspection:

- a. Type of Application: Major New License.
 - b. Project No.: 1951-037.
 - c. Date filed: August 30, 1995.
- d. Applicant: Georgia Power Company.
- e. Name of Project: Sinclair Hydroelectric Project.
- f. Location: On the Oconee River, near the Town of Milledgeville, Baldwin County, Georgia.
- g. Filed Pursuant to: Federal Power Act 16 U.S.C. §§ 791(a)–825(r).
- h. Applicant Contact: C.M. Hobson, Manager—Environmental Affairs, Georgia Power Company, 333 Piedmont Avenue—Bin No. 10170, Atlanta, GA 30308–3374, (404) 526–7778.
- i. FERC Contact: Kelly R. Fargo (202) 219–0231.
- j. Description of Project: The proposed project would utilize the following existing project facilities owned by the Georgia Power Company: (1) A 104-foothigh, 2,988-foot-long dam; (2) a powerhouse containing two 22.5-megawatt (MW) turbine/generator units with a total installed generating capacity of 45 MW; (3) a 15,330-acre reservoir; (4) an excavated tailrace; (5) a 90-footlong, 115-kilovolt, 3 phase transmission line; and (6) appurtenant facilities. The average annual generation is about 118 gigawatthours.
- k. With this notice, we are initiating consultation with the GEORGIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER (SHPO), as required by § 106, National Historic Preservation Act, and the

regulations of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, 36 CFR 800.4. Lois D. Cashell.

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–23663 Filed 9–22–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Project No. 11492-001 Idaho]

Ted S. Sorenson; Notice of Surrender of Preliminary Permit

September 19, 1995.

Take notice that Ted S. Sorenson, Permittee for the Owsley Canal Project No. 11492, has requested that its preliminary permit be terminated. The preliminary permit for Project No. 11492 was issued December 20, 1994, and would have expired November 30, 1997. The project would have been located on Birch Creek Hydroelectric Outfall Canal, in Clark and Jefferson Counties, Idaho.

The Permittee filed the request on September 5, 1995, and the preliminary permit for Project No. 11492 shall remain in effect through the thirtieth day after issuance of this notice unless that day is a Saturday, Sunday or holiday as described in 18 CFR 385.2007, in which case the permit shall remain in effect through the first business day following that day. New applications involving this project site, to the extent provided for under 18 CFR Part 4, may be filed on the next business day.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–23660 Filed 9–22–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. GT95-24-002]

Colorado Interstate Gas Co.; Notice of Filing of Refund Report

September 19, 1995

Take notice that on September 8, 1995, Colorado Interstate Gas Company (CIG) filed a third refund report in Docket Nos. GP83–11, RI83–9, et al. CIG states that the filing and refunds were made to comply with the Commission's Orders of December 1, 1993 and May 19, 1994.

CIG also states that the initial refunds were paid by CIG on December 14, 1994 and the second refund was made on April 12, 1995. The third and fourth refunds were paid on June 29, 1995 and August 8, 1995.

The September 8, 1995, refund report summarizes the refunds made as of that date by CIG for Kansas ad valorem tax overpayments pursuant to the Commission's December 1, 1993 and